



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/550,686 | 04/17/2000 | Julia Hirschberg | 2000-0026 | 1854 |
| 7590 | 06/04/2007 | | EXAMINER | |
| Mr . S H DWORETSKY AT &T CORP ROOM 2A-207 ONE AT&T WAY BEDMINSTER, NJ 07921 | | | SPOONER, LAMONT M | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2626 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/04/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/550,686 | HIRSCHBERG ET AL. |
| | Examiner Lamont M. Spooner | Art Unit 2626 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4,5,8-10,24 and 27-31 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4, 5,8-10,24 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 April 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 6/15/06, with respect to the rejection(s) of the claim(s) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of over Epstein et al (6,327,343) in view of Walsh et al (5,797,124), and further in view of Murveit et al. (Murveit, US 6,766,295).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 24, and 27, 28, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein et al (6,327,343) in view of Kanevsky et al. (Kanevesky, US 6,219,407).

As per **claims 1 and 24**, Epstein et al teach a method for indexing voice mail messages, comprising:

"Receiving one or more voice mail messages from one or more callers" (co1. 6, lines 50-55);

"Determining the identity of each of the one or more callers in each of the one or more voice mail messages by comparing the speech signals from each of the one or more voice mail messages with one or more caller speaker models" (col. 7, lines 22-26);

"Tagging each of the one or more voice mail messages with the respective identity of the caller for each respective voice mail message" (abstract, the system is able of tagging the identity I of a caller, col. 5, lines 37-45, his identification tagger 30); and

when the identify of the caller of a voice mail message cannot be determined; tagging that voice mail message as unknown" (col. 7, lines 55-61, if the identity of the caller ultimately cannot be identified, the user (voice mail subscriber) 12 may program the system trough the programming interface 38 to process the call based on the unknown caller; and the system may be programmed to store the name and originating telephone number of every caller at col. 8, lines 15-17).

a storage folder for voice mail messages from the caller corresponding to the identity (C.13.lines 39-65)

It is noted that Epstein et al teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach receiving an identity of the unknown message caller from a voice mail subscriber, and creating a storage folder for voice mail messages from the caller corresponding to the received identity. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Kanevsky et al who teaches (col. 5, lines 38-42, the subscriber enrolls the new caller, see also C.9.lines 29-35). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to modify Epstein voice mail message for callers the enrollment of new callers as taught by Kanevsky because the system would enroll any new message from a new caller for subsequent processing, i.e. storing messages from the caller in a particular folder, etc (ibid, Kanevsky).

As per **claims 4 and 27**, Epstein and Kanevsky make obvious claim 1, Epstein further teaches wherein the one or more caller speaker models are created from one or more voice mail messages left by a same caller (C.5.lines 10-17-his voice data as the voice mail message).

As per **claims 5 and 28**, Epstein and Kanevsky make obvious claim 1, Epstein further teaches wherein the one or more speaker models are created using acoustic features extracted from the voice mail message, the

acoustic features extracted using speaker recognition techniques (C.8.lines 36-56).

As per **claims 9 and 30**, Epstein and Kanevsky make obvious claim 1, Epstein further teaches wherein the step of determining the identity of each of the one or more callers in each of the one or more voice mail messages includes the substep of:

using automatic number identification to assist in determining the caller's identity (C.5 lines 52-65).

As per claims 10 and 31, Epstein and Kanevsky make obvious claim 1, Epstein further teaches, wherein the step of determining the identity of each of the one or more callers includes the substep of:

using speech recognition techniques to extract caller identity information from the one or more voice mail messages (C.8.lines 36-55).

4. Claims 8 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein et al (6,327,343) in view of Kanevsky et al. (Kanevesky, US 6,219,407), and further in view of Murveit et al. (Murveit, US 6,766,295).

As per **claim 8**, Epstein et al teach a method for indexing voice mail messages, comprising:

"Receiving one or more voice mail messages from one or more callers" (co1. 6, lines 50-55);

"Determining the identity of each of the one or more callers in each of the one or more voice mail messages by comparing the speech signals from each of the one or more voice mail messages with one or more caller speaker models" (col. 7, lines 22-26);

"Tagging each of the one or more voice mail messages with the respective identity of the caller for each respective voice mail message" (abstract, the system is able of tagging the identity I of a caller, col. 5, lines 37-45, his identification tagger 30); and

when the identify of the caller of a voice mail message cannot be determined; tagging that voice mail message as unknown" (col. 7, lines 55-61, if the identity of the caller ultimately cannot be identified, the user (voice mail subscriber) 12 may program the system trough the programming interface 38 to process the call based on the unknown caller; and the system may be programmed to store the name and originating telephone number of every caller at col. 8, lines 15-17)

It is noted that Epstein et al teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach receiving an identity of the unknown message caller from a

voice mail subscriber. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Kanevsky et al who teaches (col. 5, lines 38-42, the subscriber enrolls the new caller, see also C.9.lines 29-35). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to modify Epstein voice mail message for callers the enrollment of new callers as taught by Kanevsky because the system would enroll any new message from a new caller for subsequent processing, i.e. storing messages from the caller in a particular folder, etc (ibid, Kanevsky).

It is further noted that Epstein and Kanevsky do not explicitly teach, wherein the voice mail message tagged as unknown is used to adapt a previously created speaker model. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Murveit, who teaches adapting a previously created speaker model (abstract) in a first session with a speaker. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify the combination of Kanevsky with Epstein's model with a modified model for a first encounter for the benefit of improving the speech recognition system for a speaker (abstract) who's identity is to be determined.

As per **claim 29**, claim 29 sets forth limitations similar to claims 1 and 8 is completely within the scope of rejected claims 1, and 8, and is thus rejected for the same reasons and under the same rationale.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571/272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ims
5/23/07



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER